

EXHIBIT B

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
GOOGLE INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA
DECLARATION OF WILLIAM ADAMS IN
SUPPORT OF GOOGLE'S BILL OF COSTS
Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

1 1. My name is William Addison Adams and I have been working at FTI, Inc. since
2 December of 1997. I am currently a Senior Managing Director in FTI's Technology segment. I
3 have knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called to testify as a witness thereto could do
4 so competently under oath.

5 2. In my role at FTI I have primary supervision responsibility for FTI's delivery of
6 products and services to Google. FTI delivers e-discovery services to Google which comprise
7 data processing, review software platform consulting, and production services.

8 3. I have general knowledge of the prevailing market rates for e-discovery services.
9 Current market rates for most e-discovery services are lower than the prevailing market rates for
10 those same services in 2010 and 2011.

11 4. I understand that Google has submitted a Bill of Costs in this action and that
12 Oracle America, Inc. ("Oracle") has objected to Google's Bill of Costs, in part because, according
13 to Oracle, the rate that FTI charged Google for "Inbound Processing" was significantly higher
14 than the current market rates for that service.

15 5. FTI received thousands of gigabytes of electronic data from Google in connection
16 with this matter. FTI filtered, indexed, and transformed that data into a common format so that it
17 could be uploaded to a document-production database. That service is referred to as "Inbound
18 Processing." Inbound processing is just one of many services that FTI performed for Google in
19 connection with e-discovery in this case.

20 6. The inbound processing rate that FTI charged Google was a result of several
21 rounds of negotiation between FTI and Google, the last of which concluded in September 2010.

22 7. Google's electronically stored information is unique in comparison to other clients.
23 For instance, FTI developed custom processing routines to accommodate files extracted from the
24 Google Documents platform. Additional customizations were required to handle Google email
25 and ticketing data. The custom nature of inbound processing for Google is reflected in the price
26 FTI charged Google.

27 8. FTI's inbound processing rate was also affected by the rate it charged Google for
28 other document production related services. For example, generally, the more FTI charged for

1 inbound processing, the less it charged for outbound processing. The reasonableness of a rate for
2 a specific e-discovery task like inbound processing should be evaluated in light of all of the other
3 services performed, and the rates charged for those other services.

4 9. At the time FTI performed inbound processing services for Google in this case, the
5 rate FTI charged was reasonable and competitive in the market in light of the complexity of the
6 services performed, and the rates FTI charged for other document-production related services.

7
8 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this
9 declaration was executed at Washington, DC on August 2nd, 2012.

10
11 By: William O. Adams
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28